

Appl. No. : 09/702,455
Filed : October 31, 2000

REMARKS

Claims 1-9, 12-21 were pending in the application. Various claim amendments were made. Therefore, Claims 1-9, 12-21 are presented for examination herein.

Response to Claim Rejections – 35 USC 103

Examiner stated that previous arguments were not persuasive because Applicant "attacked only one reference" where the rejection was based on the combination of references. Applicant hereby corrects this in this amendment as follows: 1) Applicant has amended his claims to specifically distinguish over the Liddy-Adams combination and 2) Applicant provides arguments herein showing that (i) Liddy teaches away from the Applicant's invention as claimed and therefore cannot be combined with Adams to obtain the claimed invention and (ii) Even if Liddy and Adams were combined, the combination would not yield the aspects of the Applicant's invention, as claimed herein.

Claims 1-9, 12-20 have been amended such that any combination of Liddy (US6,304,864) and Adams (6,334,145) would not result in the applicants claimed invention.

Adams does not teach the concept of performing a multilevel linked search over a set of documents, but only defines how to step through and retrieve a linked set of documents. As per some of the claims herein, Adams further does not teach or suggest using URL domain boundaries to limit the linked set of documents, but only uses depth and breadth of hyperlink linkages. Domain boundaries are useful for certain types of searches encompassed by such claims.

Liddy teaches away from a combination of Liddy and Adams to obtain the Applicant's claimed invention. Liddy expressly teaches away from highly constrained and limited searches. Liddy teaches to cast a search net as wide as possible to find results that might not be reachable from a particular search engine. By sending out agents to both perform web crawling and to plug parameters into search engines, a very expansive and broad web search can be performed to find otherwise difficult to find results.

Appl. No. : 09/702,455
Filed : October 31, 2000

Liddy states (Col. 1):

FIELD OF THE INVENTION

"The present invention relates to a system (and method) for retrieving multimedia information from a computer-based network, such as the Internet, using multiple evolving intelligent agents, and relates particularly to a system for retrieving information, in terms of documents or Web pages, at network addresses **using agents for crawling through the Internet and executing searches on search engines on the Internet to retrieve documents**, in accordance with a user inputted query. The system is suitable for a user at a computer coupled to the Internet to automatically retrieve Web pages from the Internet in accordance with a natural language query."

Liddy: Col. 3:5-12:

SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION

"Accordingly, it is the **principal object of the present invention** to provide a system for **retrieving information from the Internet, and particularly the WWW**, using multiple intelligent agents, which can more efficiently retrieve document than prior art Web agent systems **by integrating both meta-searching and crawler agents**."

Liddy Col. 3:40 to 4:20: (also in: "Summary of the Invention")

"Briefly described, **the present invention embodies a system for retrieving information on a computer coupled to a computer-based network, such as the Internet, in accordance with a query. (...) The system further includes an agent server for producing multiple crawler agents and meta-search agents** under an agent leader associated with the user profile. (...) **Each crawler agent retrieves documents from the network at a different starting network address** and at other addresses linked from the document at the starting network address, and so on. **Each meta-search agent executes a search on different search engines addressable on the network in accordance with the query to retrieve documents at network addresses provided by the search engine. (...) During the search, when each of the crawler or meta-search agents retrieves a document, (...)"**

Appl. No. : 09/702,455
Filed : October 31, 2000

Liddy at Col. 10, line 31 states: "No restrictions need be placed on the number of levels of linked documents from the document at the first Web address. If any crawler agent locates multiple link addresses in a document, the address is temporarily stored in a queue in memory 19 until the same of another crawler agent is available to retrieve a document from the WWW associated with that address."

Liddy at Col. 10, line states: "The agent leader can reuse existing crawler agents which have stopped crawling due to all addresses linked to their stating address have been retrieved."

Liddy teaches in an opposite direction away from the current invention. One of ordinary skill in the art, without the hindsight of the present invention disclosure, would not have been motivated to combine Liddy with Adams. This is because Liddy expressly stated there is no need to do this, and also because doing so would violate the purpose of Liddy which is to search in as many areas as possible to locate all documents, to include hard-to-find documents, and to filter the set of all found documents using a neural network based filtering algorithm. But more importantly, Liddy mixes crawler agents with meta agents to insert the search string into additional search engines and to thereby prohibit any resulting combination form providing a set of search results guaranteed to be limited to a linked set of documents, as claimed by Applicant.

Liddy states as a principal object of her invention is "to provide a system for retrieving information (...) by integrating both meta-searching and crawler agents."

As such, there is no motivation to combine Liddy with Adams to obtain the applicant's invention because Liddy teaches away from any such combination. Liddy is interested casting a net as broadly as possible to dig out hard to find information. The present invention focuses on systems and methods to enable a user to drill down deeper by searching over a well defined limited volume of web space as referenced from a current web page of interest.

Now suppose, arguendo, that Adams and Liddy were combined. Then the combination would not satisfy especially limitations such as:

Appl. No. : 09/702,455
Filed : October 31, 2000

wherein each document in the returned set of documents includes content as defined by the first parameter and is guaranteed to be a member of the linked set of documents as defined by the second parameter; and

wherein the first parameter is not re-entered into any embedded search engines found in the linked set of documents or any other search engines to extend the search beyond the linked set of documents.

This is because any combination of Adams and Liddy would both cover a multilevel search and would integrate this with a search engine search and necessarily obtain documents outside of the search definition as defined by Applicants invention.

Also, Adams Fig 10, 11 does not teach, limitations such as:

a second parameter that identifies a set of linked set of documents that are linked via one or more levels of hyperlinks from a target web page and the hyperlinks point are constrained to point to documents within the boundaries of a specified domain;

This type of search space constraint is void of both Adams and Liddy. Moreover, neither Adams nor Liddy teach or suggest, alone or in combination, the concept of only retrieving documents having a specified file type in a search. Hence claims such as claim 6 is not taught or suggested by any combination of Adams and Liddy.

Summary

Claims 1-9, 12-21 were presented for examination herein. Applicant respectfully submits Adams and Liddy are not combinable to obtain the Applicant's claimed invention and further that that these claims are not rendered obvious by any combination of Liddy and Adams. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to issue a notice of allowance for all pending claims.

Applicant notes that any amendments or claim cancellations made herein and not substantively discussed above are made solely for the purposes of more clearly and particularly describing and claiming the invention, and not for purposes of overcoming art. The Examiner should infer no (i) adoption of a position with respect to patentability, (ii) change in the Applicant's position with respect to any claim or subject matter of the

Appl. No. : 09/702,455
Filed : October 31, 2000

invention, or (iii) acquiescence in any way to any position taken by the Examiner, based on such amendments or cancellations not substantively discussed.

Furthermore, any remarks made herein with respect to a given claim or amendment are intended only in the context of that specific claim or amendment, and should not be applied to other claims, amendments, or aspects of Applicant's invention.

Applicant specifically reserves the right to prosecute claims of differing and broader scope than those presented herein in a continuation application.

Lastly, Applicant notes that any amendments made by this paper which are not specifically discussed herein are made solely for the purpose of more clearly and particularly pointing out and claiming Applicant's invention.

If the Examiner has any questions or comments which may be resolved over the telephone, he is requested to call the undersigned at (305) 735-8533, fax a message at 305-437-7670, or send an email to dsperic@aol.com.

Respectfully submitted,

Eric M. Dowling

Dated: June 17, 2005

By: 

Eric M. Dowling
Registration No. 44,094
Interlink 731
PO Box 02-5635
Miami, FL 33102-5635
Tel: (305) 735-8533
Fax: (305) 437-7670

EMD/Mult.001-CIP1
6/17/05